

### REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 14 and 24 are amended herein. No new matter is presented and entry and approval are requested. Claim 18 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 14-17 and 19-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

#### Amendment To Claims

Claim 14 is amended herein to add features recited in dependent claim 18 that is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 14 is also amended herein to include other features supported, for example, by paragraphs [0034], [0045] and [0043] of the specification. Claim 24 is amended herein in a similar manner.

No new matter is submitted and entry and approval of the amended claims are requested.

#### Traverse Of Rejections

In item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 14-15, 17, 19, 23-24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated, by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Chen (U.S.P. 7,215,659).

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 16, 20-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chen in view of Sugaya et al. (US-7,277,412)

The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that all of the features recited by each of at least each of independent claims 14 and 24 are not taught nor suggested by an *arguendo* combination of Chen and Sugaya.

Independent claim 14, for example, recites a method including " . . . sending a message by the first radio communication system that is a cellular system to at least some of the radio stations of the second radio communication system with instructions for organizing communication within the second radio communication system; . . . wherein the information concerning the organization relates to at least one of the timing of at least one period of time for communication within the second radio communication system based on a centrally controlled radio access method and the timing of at least one period of time for communication within the second radio communication system based on a decentrally controlled radio access method,

wherein centrally assignment of radio resources takes place by the cellular system, and wherein at least one centralized as well as at least one decentralized period of time are assigned to the second communication system, and at least one centralized as well as at least one decentralized period of time are assigned to the second communication system." (Emphasis added). Claim 24 has a similar recitation.

By contrast with claims 14 and 24, Chen merely teaches overlapping communication frequencies which might lead to a collision problem when data transmissions interfere with one another during wireless transmit. A device for moderating transmission traffic in a wireless network where overlapping communication frequency coexist is described to reduce or avoid interference caused by signal collisions.

By contrast with claims 14 and 24, Sugaya merely teaches a Personal Area Networks (PAN) communication system environment wherein each wireless network detects an unused channel slot in the network frame and wherein a PAN system is operating in decentralized manner.

By contrast with claims 14 and 24, Chen and/or Sugaya do not teach cellular networks, do not teach assignment of centralized time slots and decentralized time slots as claimed, do not teach assignment of centralized and decentralized time slots in exchange for the same second communication system, and do not teach a centrally assignment of radio resources by a first communication system / cellular system to a the second communication system

That is, an *arguendo* combination of Chen and Sugaya merely teaches timing information for a centralized system and a timing for a decentralized system, and not features recited by each of the independent claims.

Applicants submit that even an *arguendo* combination of Chen and Sugaya does not teach one communication system nor using centralized and decentralized method in one communication system

Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and independent claims 14 and 24 allowed.

\* \*

Dependent claims 15-17, 19-23, and 25-26 inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reason discussed above. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims 14-17 and 19-26 allowed.

**Conclusion**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 23, 2009

By: Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501